DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 257 246 EC 172 573

AUTHOR	Browder, Diane M.; And Others
TITLE	Predictors of Eligibility for ESY. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Lehigh Univ., Bethlehem, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY	Special Education Programs (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Aug 84
GRANT	G00830034
NOTE	86p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Secondary Education; *Eligibility; *Extended School Year; *Prediction; Self Care Skills; *Severe Mental Retardation
IDENTIFIERS	Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

Evaluation of eligibility for extended school year (ESY) services was made based on informaton contained in school files in a stratified sampling across Pennsylvania. Subjects had been classified as severely and profoundly mentally retarded and were divided into groups based on eligibility for programming in excess of 180 days or ineligibility for these services. The variables related to the eligibility criteria set forth in "Battle v. Commonwealth" including the nature and severity of the handicaps, self-sufficiency, and skill regression. Also, several administrative variables were examined. The analysis revealed that the ESY group had received more diagnoses of health impairments and had had more school initiated contacts with parents. The ESY group also had more objectives that were incomplete and of indeterminable self-sufficiency. Results are reviewed for recommendations for future research and practice. Appendixes contain correspondence and data collection sheets. (Author/CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED257246

PREDICTORS OF ELIGIBILITY FOR ESY
FINAL REPORT

Diane M. Browder, Principal Investigator
Francis E. Lentz, Principal Co-Investigator
Timothy Knoster, Research Assistant
Carol Wilansky, Research Assistant

August 1984

Lehigh University

Grant # G00830034

Project # 023JH30007

EC175573

Table of Contents

	Page Number
Abstract	iii
Documentation of Accomplishments	iv
Literature Review	1
Methodology	8
Results and Tables	18
Discussion	31
References	44

The abstract is not included.

Appendices

A Research Permission from Intermediate Unit Executive Committee (omitted)

B Invitation to Participate to I.U.'s

C Thank You Letter to I.U.'s who Chose Not to Participate (omitted)

D Follow Up Letter to Participants

E Stratified sample

F Parent Permission Letter

G Data Collection Protocol

Documentation of Accomplishment

of Project Objectives

Objective One: To answer research questions raised on eligibility for ESY.

Anticipated Accomplishments	Date Accomplished
1.1 Secure I.U. approval	December 1983 for 12 I.U.'s (Appendix A, B)
1.2 Select I.U.'s	Utilized all 12 (Appendix)
1.3 Secure parental approval	January 1984, March 1984 (Appendix D)
1.4 Select subjects	More subjects: January 1984, March 1984 (Table 1)
1.5 Collect data from files	April 1984 (Appendix E)
1.6 Analyze data	June 1984 Second analysis - August 1984 (See Results Section)
1.7 Prepare research report	August 1984 (This Document)

Objective Two: To influence special education administrators.

2.1	Consult with Joe Mickley to plan dissemination	Meeting September 1984
2.2	Disseminate results on Special Net	September 1984
2.3	Telephone or site visits to all I.U.'s or director's meeting	Report to meeting of all directors September 28, 1984 Harrisburg, PA Full-time report and workshop to large urban I.U. administrators September 21, 1984
2.4	Mail research results to I.U. directors	Hand-delivered report September 28, 1984
2.5	Submit article to journal that includes administrative audience	Article submitted to Exceptional Children September 1984

Objective Three: To influence parents' expectations.

3.1	Submit article to Exceptional Parent	Submitted article September 1984
3.2	Article in local newspaper	September 1984

Objective Four: To inspire further research

4.1 Present results to colleagues at Lehigh	Colloquium September 1984
4.2 Submit article for publication (issues for further research)	Submitted to School Psychology Review September 1984
4.3 Present findings to graduate students at Lehigh and advise students who pursue research on similar topics	Students invited to colloquium (See 4.1) Browder and Lentz on committee of Karen Beatty who did dissertation on ESY for learning disabled Graduate Assistant, Tim Knoster, completed independent study on ESY/IEP objectives to be developed into article

Literature Review

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, also known as P.L. 94-142 (20 U.S.C. §1401) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. §794) have impacted greatly services for students whose handicaps are severe. In the decade following these acts, many local education agencies have created their first public school services for severely handicapped individuals to comply with The Education for All Handicapped Children Act's requirement for a free appropriate education in the least restrictive environment.

The parameters of a free appropriate education are defined broadly in the act and become further defined in each handicapped student's individualized educational plan. Right to education suits have set precedents for service parameters for severely handicapped students including, for example: 1) that educational goals relate to self-sufficiency (Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Citizens v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 1971; Fialkowski v. Shapp, 1975), 2) that education be provided in public school settings (Joseph C. v. Talladega County Board of Education, 1981), and 3) that educational programming not be limited by a 180-day rule (Armstrong v. Kline, 1979; Battle v. Commonwealth, 1980). This latter ruling, that a 180-day rule interferes with a handicapped student's right to a free appropriate education, has led to provision of extended school year services for severely handicapped students.

Issues in Provision of Extended School Year Services

In the current era of fiscal restraint, expanding educational services for severely handicapped students has been a controversial issue (Healey & Reichman, 1982; Stotland & Mancuso, 1982). The controversy has focused on three particular points. The first is the rationale for providing additional

services for severely handicapped students. Traditionally, summer compensatory programs have been established for disadvantaged and handicapped children to help them overcome their academic deficits (Austin, Rogers, & Walbesser, 1974; Cornelius & Semmel, 1982; Leviton & Kiraly, 1975). The premise for this extra instructional time was that more time would influence achievement. In a review of research on instructional time, Rieth, Polgrove, and Semmel (1979) concluded that time does influence achievement.

Plaintiffs in the case of Armstrong v. Kline also contended that extended instructional time would influence student progress. However, the goals for progress presented for the severely handicapped students represented in this suit were self-sufficiency. To determine if a 180-day restraint interferred with the plaintiff's right to an appropriate education as set forth in P.L.94-142, the district court in Armstrong v. Kline considered the goals for education of severely handicapped children as presented in legislative history. In particular, the PARC decision and senate debates preceding passage of P.L. 94-142 had presented the need of every child to become self-sufficient, within the limits of his or her handicap.

While every handicapped child might benefit from an extended program, severely handicapped children may have unique characteristics that require extended services to achieve self-sufficiency (Rieth, et al., 1979). In Armstrong v. Kline (1979), the plaintiffs presented an argument to support a regression-recoupment syndrome. Their testimony contended that breaks in programming resulted in skill loss for some severely handicapped students. The plaintiffs further argued that since these children learn slowly and often required caretaking that usurped instructional time, a significant amount of instruction had to be devoted to skill recoupment which allowed little time to instruct new skills. The defendants accepted the phenomena of skill regression

but attributed it to teacher incompetence, nonfunctionality of skills being taught, and the parents' failure to reinforce skills. The judge noted that virtually no evidence was brought to support these other variables and acknowledged the influence of instructional time on the quest for self-sufficiency.

A second point of debate in the provision of extended school year services is the amount of instructional time (i.e., number of days) adequate to maintain skills across a summer break. To date there is no research comparing instructional time options for extended services. In the absence of such research, the number of days and hours per day for extended school year services varies greatly across intermediate units (Pennsylvania Department of Education EAHB Reports, 1983). Also, Stotland and Mancuso (1982) have noted a trend in decreasing services across years without giving parents sufficient prior notice to take this change to due process.

A third issue in providing extended school year services has been determining who should be eligible for these services. Although all plaintiffs in Armstrong v. Kline (1979) were classified as either severely and profoundly or severely emotionally disturbed, the district court's ruling used broader language to describe the class as "all handicapped school-aged persons in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania who require or may require a program of special education and related services in excess of 180 days" (p. 586). In an appeal to the appellate court (Battle v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 1980), the issue of class definition was not raised by either party. However, in a dissenting opinion, Appellate Judge Van Dussen offered a re-definition of the class as "Those school aged individuals who are severely emotionally disturbed or severely and profoundly impaired and whose regression-recoupment syndrome is so severe that the traditional summer vacation period occasioned by the 180-day policy brings their overall progress for the year to a virtual standstill" (Battle v.

Commonwealth of Pa., 1980, p. 282). The judge's opinion influenced Pennsylvania's eligibility guidelines (Planning for extended school year, 1980). Stotland and Mancuso (1982), who were counsel for the plaintiffs in Armstrong v. Kline, contend that in appropriate extended school year implementation the district or intermediate unit evaluates automatically severely handicapped children for extended school year services but does not refuse to consider children outside this target group.

In summarizing the impact of Battle v. Commonwealth, Larsen, Goodman, and Glean (1981) noted the eligibility criteria to be 1) the handicapping condition of the child (severely handicapped), 2) the presence of the regression-recoupment phenomena, and 3) the goal of self-sufficiency. Additionally, Larsen, et al. (1981), advocated that skill acquisition can also be a justifiable goal for extended school year services.

Evaluation of Extended School Year Services

Each of the service provision issues--impact of services, parameters of service and eligibility--nees to be evaluated further to identify empirically based guidelines for services.

To date the research that has been conducted on extended school year services has focused on service impact (Bahling, 1980, Edgar, Spence, & Kenowitz, 1977; McMahon, 1983). In each case the evaluation has relied on pretest-posttest checklists or teacher judgments rather than direct ongoing assessment. Thus, further investigation on service impact is needed to evaluate the cross time skill performance of students whose performance often reflects daily variability. By contrast, there has been no research on comparing divergent service parameters nor on variables related to service eligibility. The current research focused on this latter issue--service eligibility.

Eligibility

The criteria established in Judge Van Dussen's opinion are sufficiently broad to permit wide discrepancies in practice. These three criteria include: 1) the nature and severity of the handicapping condition, 2) evidence of regression-recoupment that impedes, and 3) self-sufficiency. Using the type of handicapping condition is complicated by the varying classification systems that exist across states. In Pennsylvania, the home state of Battle v. Commonwealth (1980), the Guidelines for Special Education do not include a category entitled "severely emotionally disturbed" except as one disability in a severely multihandicapping condition. Yet this term was one suggested by the judge's opinion. Many states have moved towards a generic definition of "severely handicapped" students (Geiger & Justen, 1983). Given the variation in definitions, using a student's classification for extended school year services, may have differential impact on students' eligibility across localities. Also, any problems in assessing and classifying children will be carried over to extended school year eligibility. These can include, for example, reliance on intelligence scores for difficult to test children who have physical or sensory impairments (Duncan, Sbardelleti, Maheady, & Sainato, 1981).

The second criteria, regression-recoupment, implies measurement. In evaluating extended school year programs prior to Armstrong v. Kline, Edgar, Spence, and Kenowitz (1977) noted the absence of reliable and valid measurement. Larsen, et al., (1981) advocated that continuous, systematic collection of data throughout the school year be used to evaluate regression and recoupment. Turner (1983) reiterated this need and further noted that daily or weekly measurement should be used and should include interrater reliability. Obviously, a prerequisite to such measurement is defining extended school year goals in observable, measurable terms. Meyen (1977) suggests that objectives

state: 1) the target behavior, 2) the condition for performance, and 3) the criteria for mastery. By stating these components, a teacher develops an objective that can reliably be measured and evaluated. These components of an objective have been widely advocated (Turnbull, Strickland, and Brantly, 1978; Snell, 1983).

The third criteria, that extended school year goals relate to self-sufficiency, requires a definition of self-sufficiency. Self-sufficiency has been described in numerous resources on curriculum development for severely handicapped individuals (e.g., Brown, Nietupski, & Hamre-Nietupski, 1976; Guess & Noonan, 1982; Rincover, Koegel, & Egel, 1982; Sailor & Guess, 1983; Snell, 1983). Common to these descriptions is a theme that self-sufficient or "functional" goals relate directly to skills that can be used in community settings. These goals set forth instructions to be conducted with real materials in activities that would be performed by a non-handicapped peer in non-school as well as school settings. While this interpretation of self-sufficiency is widely accepted in texts on teaching students with severe handicaps, it falls short of providing a measurable definition. Also, many teachers have not been trained to work with severely handicapped students per se (Geiger & Justen, 1983) and may not have been exposed to the concept of "functionality" in their teacher training programs. To make this criteria more explicit, a definition of self-sufficiency needs to be developed that can be evaluated reliably. Teachers need training to understand and apply this concept to the development of students' individualized education plans.

Evaluating Current Practice

The question of eligibility was chosen for the research presented here because this question would logically precede an evaluation of service impact. For example, if children placed in extended school year services do not clearly show regression, an evaluation of service impact potentially would be biased towards skill maintenance. However, no research to date has evaluated eligibility.

This research sought to take a first evaluation step to discover if current practice in determining eligibility is adequate. The question posed was: Given the broad eligibility guidelines, does current practice identify two distinct groups--those who require extended school year services and those who do not? The eligibility criteria that seemed to be clearest was classification as a severely and profoundly mentally retarded or severely emotionally disturbed student. This class of students was identified by Judge Van Dussen in Battle v. Commonwealth (1980) and again in an interpretation of this suit by Larsen, et al. (1981). Further, these classifications had been assigned to the plaintiffs in Armstrong v. Kline (1979). Of course, one of these classifications alone does not qualify the child for extended school year services. The student also should have evidence of potential regression on self-sufficiency objectives. The current research evaluated differences between children eligible or not eligible for extended school year services but focused on children classified as severely handicapped. Variables used to compare differences included characteristics of the handicapping condition, the nature of the student's individualized objectives, and evidence of potential regression.

In making this evaluation, the impact of Armstrong v. Kline (1979) and Battle v. Commonwealth (1980) on existing practice of determining eligibility

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

for extended school year services can be described. Over the past decade, the impact of law on special education programming has been the subject of several investigations (Kuriloff, Kirp, and Buss, 1979; Weatherly, 1979; Kirp, 1974).

The research sought to evaluate differences between severely and profoundly mentally retarded students and severely emotionally disturbed students classified as eligible for extended school year services versus those classified as ineligible based on data contained in school files including: 1) test scores, 2) school year placement, 3) chronological age, 4) educational or psychological labels, 5) medical or psychiatric labels, 6) number of school year objectives related to self-sufficiency, 7) precision of measurement for self-sufficiency objectives, 8) evidence of regression, 9) number of years of prior placement in ESY, and 10) frequency of recorded parent contacts. The first five variables related to the eligibility criteria of the nature and severity of the handicaps. The sixth and seventh addressed the self-sufficiency criteria. The eighth variable was concerned with the regression criteria. The last two variables listed were related to administrative procedures that could be influential in the absence of precise eligibility criteria. All information obtained for these variables was recorded from the student's written school records.

Methodology

Site Selection

The proposed research was presented to a meeting of the intermediate unit directors of special education on June 29, 1983. Permission to conduct this research also was obtained from the Intermediate Unit Executive Committee (Appendix A). In October, all intermediate units were contacted to invite

their participation (Appendix B). If an intermediate unit decided not to participate, they were thanked for their consideration (Appendix C). If an intermediate unit did not reply, the project staff made at least three more contacts prior to the deadline to ensure that they had received the invitation. By the project's December deadline for agreement to participate, twelve intermediate units agreed to participate, ten chose not to participate, and seven did not reply to the invitation. To protect confidentiality, the intermediate units who participated will not be identified. The sample included a large urban intermediate unit, several smaller cities, and rural areas spread across all regions of the state.

Subject Selection

The subject selection criteria were that in the academic year 1981-1982 the subject either qualified to receive extended school year services in the summer of 1982 (ESY group) or did not qualify (non-ESY group). Whether or not the subjects actually enrolled in the summer program was not a criteria for inclusion in the ESY group. Subjects in both groups also had to be classified as severely or profoundly mentally retarded (a category in Pennsylvania Standards for Special Education) or severely emotionally disturbed. Since this latter label was not a Pennsylvania category for classification, the project staff included students diagnosed as severely emotionally disturbed, autistic, or severely multihandicapped with one handicap being severe emotional disturbance (only the latter of these terms was a Pennsylvania category for classification; the other two might be classified "socially and emotionally disturbed").

After the intermediate units' participation was secured, the project staff contacted each intermediate unit to identify the total number of severely and profoundly mentally retarded and severely emotionally disturbed children

in each. These numbers were used for stratified sampling of subjects by population number in each intermediate unit. The response for numbers of severely and mentally retarded children were received. Several intermediate units sought clarification for the term "severely emotionally disturbed." Also, some intermediate units did not have these students identified apart from the larger population of socially and emotionally disturbed students. To avoid inclusion of a population that was not identified as such across the field, the researchers excluded severely emotionally disturbed students from the research.

Once the total number of students classified as severely and profoundly mentally retarded (SPR) in the 12 intermediate units was identified, the project staff provided each intermediate unit with a method to identify students to include in the research and a packet of parental consent letters. In this procedure, the project staff gave the intermediate units the number of letters to send (based on the stratified sampling) and a list of random numbers to use to determine who from their list should receive the letter. The project staff sent the intermediate units over 400 parent letters in hopes of receiving 300 parental consent letters. A total of parental consent letters were received, and parental letters choosing not to participate. The project staff sent a second set of letters, if necessary, to ensure adequate stratified sampling of intermediate units by size (about % of their ESY students and % of their non-ESY students) A final subject sample of 194 students was obtained (105 ESY, 89 non-ESY). The stratified sampling is shown in Table One.

Procedures

To obtain information to compare each group of students, the project staff traveled to the intermediate units and reviewed each subject's school records. Most of the information was recorded by the research assistants (graduate students in special education and school psychology). The principal investigators and research assistants also conducted independent duplicate recording to assess accuracy of recording. These reliability checks were made for 14% of the subjects across three sites.

Prior to collecting the data for this research, the project staff spent three months practicing data collection in an area intermediate unit and private school with subjects not included in the study, but for whom parental permission was obtained. This practice period enabled the staff to refine the recording method and obtain adequate reliability for recording.

The data collection method was outlined and attached to a data collection sheet. For each subject the staff followed this procedure to record information on a subject:

1. At the school site, the staff person asked the contact person for all records on the student and (if an ESY student) all ESY records.
2. Next, the staff person read through the entire folder to locate all relevant information.
3. The staff person filled out the data collection sheet in order with these materials: the variable definition sheet, an information location sheet, and the student's folder.
4. After finishing the sheet, the staff person replaced all materials in the student's folder as found.

5. The staff person returned the folder to the I.U. person.
6. The staff person coded the data collection sheet as ESY or non-ESY and gave the subject a number and checked to black out or erase any citation of the student's name or intermediate unit name.

Variable Descriptions Used for Recording and Record Location

The variables were described as follows. A written copy of these definitions were used for reference while recording each subject's information. These variables were further defined for coding and evaluation as described in a later section.

Variable Name	Description	Record Location
1. Test Information	Tests given 9/1/76 - 4/1/82. Include IQ test or developmental checklists. Record test name, date given, score, professional, role of tester, professional role of report writer, and any notes specifying "untestable".	Total folder and including evaluation reports.
2. School Year Placement	Record if self-contained full-time or part-time and if public, private school or institution. Record all related services.	Front cover of 81-82 I.E.P.
3. Chronological Age	Birth date	Front cover of 81-82 I.E.P. or if missing, most recent psychological report

	Variable Name	Description	Record Location
4.	Educational/ Psychological Labels	Labels given in reports dated 9/1/76 - 7/1/82 by teachers or psychologists. Use only most recent file or if more than one, use all for that year. Record labels not behavioral descriptions.	Total folder - psychological file and then educational file.
5.	Medical/Psychiatric Labels	Labels given in reports dated 9/1/76 - 7/1/82. Record all labels and diagnoses by physicians or psychiatrists. Use most recent report or if more than one in most recent year, all for that year (e.g., quadriplegia, deaf, tuberous sclerosis, thyroid problem, mentally retarded, etc.).	Total folder - medical file then psychological file (by psychiatrist).
6.	School Year Objectives on Self-Sufficiency	Photocopy the 81-82 I.E.P. if school permits or record it verbatim.	I.E.P.
7.	Precision of Measurement for I.E.P.	Photocopy the 81-82 I.E.P. if school permits or record it verbatim.	I.E.P.
8.	Evidence of Regression	Record any comments or reports related to ESY or skill regression. Note measurement used. Record ESY objectives, verbatim.	ESY file - Educational file. Total folder.
9.	Number of Years Prior ESY	Count and record number of years received ESY.	ESY file - Educational file. Total folder.

Variable Name	Description	Record Location
10. Frequency of Parent Contacts	Record if contact was phone or letter, who initiated, and date for the time span 6/1/81 - 9/1/82. Exclude report cards sent by school to parent.	Total folder.

Variable Descriptions for Coding and Evaluation

After all information was collected, the 10 variables were further defined for coding and evaluation. Not all information recorded was relevant to the definitions. Only the information defined for each variable was used for the subject comparisons. "Missing data" was coded wherever the defined information could not be located in the folder. These definitions were as follows:

Variable	Definition	Coding
1. Test Information	Intelligence tests had to be listed in Buros Mental Measurement Yearbook. Developmental Checklist had to be a commercially available test. Since most developmental tests were not standardized, scores were not used.	IQ test IQ score Dev. test Missing data Untestable
2. School Year Placement	Placement as defined by Deno (1970). Deno's (1970) cascade of placement was with the lowest number representing institutionalization.	Rank of placement. Number of related services.
3. Chronological Age	Age in years and month as of June 1984.	Birthdate (converted to age in computer program)

Variable	Definition	Coding
4. Educational/Psychological Labels	Classify all labels listed by psychologists or educators as one of 10 categories: severe mental deficiency, sensory impairments, communication impairments, physical deficiencies or handicaps, health impairments, congenital syndrome, seizure or convulsive disorder or medication, mild moderate mental deficiency, CNS disorder, psychological or emotional impairment or unknown.	Number of labels given to subject in each of the 10 categories.
5. Medical/Psychiatric Labels	Labels given by physicians and psychiatrists classified into the same 10 categories as variable 4.	Number of labels by category.
6. School Year Objectives on Self-Sufficiency	Two Part Definition: a) Each objective was classified as self-sufficient, non-self-sufficient, or indeterminable. Self-sufficient includes an overt observable behavior to be performed in a real context or with real materials (context or materials stated or implied). Non-self-sufficient states artificial context or material--one used only in teaching and not in life outside school. Indeterminable. No observable behavior stated or no material specified or implied or physical positioning equipment only material listed.	

Variable	Definition	Coding
	b) Each objective was also classified by whether it included a three-part behavioral objective as described by Meyen (1977) including the condition, behavior, and criteria for mastery.	
		Objectives were coded according to number of objective components listed (b) and self-sufficiency (a). There are 24 combinations of categories (a) and (b) combined. The number of objectives that fell in each of the 4 combinations was coded. An objective could only be listed for one of the 24 combinations. There was a code for missing I.E.P.
7. Precision of Measurement - I.E.P.	Precision of measurement was defined as including 10 categories: indeterminable, indirect-anecdotal data, indirect-informal checklist, indirect-formal checklist, anecdotal unspecified data, anecdotal based on direct assessment, direct assessment with non-standard measurement, direct assessment with standard measurement and reliability, standard reliable judgment, and direct standard reliable frequency measure. All information found on ESY.	Number of objectives measured by each technique coded

Variable	Definition	Coding
8. Evidence of Regression	The same categories used for variable 7 were used to categorize variable 8.	Number of objectives for each category (see #7).
9. Number of Years Prior in ESY	The number of years counted that considered eligible to receive ESY.	Number of years or indeterminable if data missing.
10. Frequency of Parental Contacts and School Contacts	Any contacts in 81-82 except school report cards. Code as school initiated or parent initiated.	Number by school and number by parent.

Coding Procedure

A two-step procedure was used to code the information for the computer analysis. In the first, the staff person went through the data collection sheet and coded all relevant information using the definitions described. Second, the person transferred these numbers to Fortran computer sheets. The staff practiced this two-step coding procedure together with the first few subjects' protocols. Then, accuracy was assessed for independent coding for 60 of the 195 subjects by having a second person code the protocol and transfer the number independent from the first coder. Accuracy for coding ranged from 96-100%. After the data was entered into the computer, keypunch accuracy was assessed for 30 protocols and found to be 99.99%.

Statistical Analysis

The differences between the ESY and non-ESY groups on each of the ten variables were analyzed using Pearson's Chi Square (Meyers, 1972).

Results

Reliability

Reliability was calculated for 14% (27) of the cases in three sites for transcribing data from the records ranged from 64 to 100% with a mean of 86%. Reliability for coding data was calculated on 60 subjects (31%) for each variable and ranged from 96 to 100% with a mean of 98%. Reliability for key punching data was evaluated for 31 cases (16%) and found to be 97.4%.

Between Group Comparisons

Table 1-12 show the group means for each variable and variable category. Differences were found between groups that were above the OS probability level. The extended school year group had more health impairment labels given by physicians or psychiatrists. School initiated contact had a significance level that approached acceptable alpha levels (p .08). The ESY group had fewer objectives in each objective component category and fewer self sufficiency objectives. The ESY group had more objectives than the non ESY group that had indeterminable self sufficiency. No differences existed for non self-sufficiency objectives. Since the groups differed in the number of subjects, proportional means were also analyzed and found to show the same pattern of significance. Data was missing from all categories. Data was missing for most subjects on skill regression and testability.

Table 1

DEGREE AND NATURE OF HANDICAP

Test Information

	ESY		Non-ESY	
	No. of Subjects		No. of Subjects	
Statements on Testability				
Testable	40		40	
Untestable	1		4	
Missing Data	n = 64		n = 45	
IQ Test Data	Number with Test	IQ Converted to $\frac{z}{x}$ Score $\bar{X}$ S.D.	Number with Test $\bar{X}$ S.D.	IQ Converted to $\frac{z}{x}$ Score $\bar{X}$ S.D.
Slosson	22	-5.20 .56	19 .48	-5.05 .48
Binet	5	-3.99 .89	5 1.	-4.86 1.04
PPVT	0	-- --	2	-2.24 3.72
PTI	1	-3.94 --	0	-- --
		-4.94		-4.79

Table 2

DEGREE AND NATURE OF THE HANDICAP

School Year Placement and Related Services

Placement	Available Data (n = 71)		Available Data (n = 56)	
1. Institution Based Class	0		0	
2. Homebound Instruction	0		0	
3. Special School	8		8	
4. Full Time Special Class	56		49	
5. Part Time Special Class	0		0	
6. Regular Class and Resource	0		0	
7. Regular Class	0		0	
8. Indeterminable	7		2	
9. Missing Data	34		33	

Number of Related Services	Number of Subjects Per Number of Services	
0	2	0
1	3	7
2	22	9
3	12	24
4	15	8
5	12	7
6	5	3
7	0	1
	233	189
	$\bar{x}$ = 3.29 Mode = 4	$\bar{x}$ = 3.38 Mode = 3

Table 3

DEGREE AND NATURE OF THE HANDICAP

Chronlogical Age

Number of Cases Available	ESY N = 104	non-ESY N = 86
	$\bar{X}$ = 12.58	$\bar{X}$ = 14.41
	S.D. = 4.30	S.D. = 4.05

Table 4

DEGREE AND NATURE OF THE HANDICAP

Number of Diagnostic Labels Given by Psychologists and Educators

	ESY n = 102			Non-ESY n - 83		
	Cases with Label	$\bar{X}$/Subject	S.D.	Cases with Label	$\bar{X}$/Subject	S.D.
1. Severe mental deficiency	77	.87	.62	62	.96	.74
2. Sensory impairments	18	.21	.47	16	.27	.70
3. Communication impairments	15	.16	.39	15	.19	.43
4. Physical deficiencies	45	.71	1.06	37	.87	1.31
5. Health impairments	15	.20	.51	8	.13	.46
6. Congenital syndromes	8	.08	.27	8	.10	.30
7. Seizure-convulsive dis.	37	.47	.75	23	.38	.74
8. Moderate-mild mental def.	8	.11	.43	3	.04	.19
9. CNS disorder	8	.08	.27	9	.11	.32
10. Psychological - emot. imp.	7	.07	.25	1	.04	.24
11. Other types	20	.21	.43	17	.21	.41
Mean Labels per student		$\bar{X}$ = 3.17 S.D.= 2.27			$\bar{X}$ = 3.30 S.D.= 2.4	
Number of Cases Missing	n = 3			n = 6		

Table 5

DEGREE AND NATURE OF THE HANDICAP

Number of Diagnostic Labels Given by Physicians and Psychiatrists

Number of Cases Available	ESY (n = 66)			non-ESY (n = 51)			
	Cases with Label	$\bar{x}$/Subject	SD	Cases with Label	$\bar{x}$/Subject	SD	sig
1. Severe mental deficiency	21	.32	.47	9	.38	.56	
2. Sensory impairments	17	.26	.51	12	.24	.58	
3. Communication impairments	10	.15	.40	8	.16	.37	
4. Physical deficiencies	65	.98	.99	57	1.11	1.26	
5. Health impairments	29	.44	.90	8	.16	.42	$p < .04$*
6. Congenital syndromes	9	.13	.35	6	.11	.33	
7. Seizure-convulsive disorders	64	.97	1.26	39	.76	1.01	
8. Moderate-mild mental deficiency	2	.03	.25	2	.04	.20	
9. CNS disorder	5	.08	.32	8	.16	.37	
10. Psychological-emotional impairments	3	.05	.21	7	.14	.40	
11. Other types	36	.55	.75	24	.47	.54	
Mean Labels Per Student	$\bar{x}$ = 3.96 SD = 2.6			$\bar{x}$ = 3.7 SD = 2.04			
Number of Cases Missing	n = 40			n = 38			

Table 6

NUMERICAL MEANS AND PROPORTIONAL MEANS FOR OBJECTIVE COMPONENTS AND STATEMENTS OF SELF-SUFFICIENCY

		Numerical Means		Proportional Means	
		ESY	Non-ESY	ESY	Non-ESY
		n = 56	n = 35	n = 56	n = 35
Components					
Behavior	$\bar{x}$	8.04	12.17*	.56	.76***
	S.D.	6.94	9.82	.24	.26
Condition	$\bar{x}$	3.13	8.08***	.25	.49***
	S.D.	4.49	9.02	.27	.30
Criteria	$\bar{x}$	7.77	12.60	.55	.80**
	S.D.	9.00	10.71	.43	.29
Self-Sufficiency Criteria					
Self-Sufficiency	$\bar{x}$	4.68	8.20***	.34	.50**
	S.D.	4.09	7.64	.29	.20
Non-Self-Sufficiency	$\bar{x}$	.77	1.51	.05	.07
	S.D.	2.16	2.50	.14	.11
Indeterminable	$\bar{x}$	7.32	5.08*	.62	.43**
	S.D.	5.04	4.01	.26	.31

Missing Data

ESY (n = 48)
Non-ESY (n = 54)

*p < .05
**p < .01
***p < .001

Table 7

ANALYSES OF VARIANCE FOR PROPORTION OF CASES WITH OBJECTIVE COMPONENTS

I. ANOVA for Proportion of Objectives that Stated a Behavior

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	.88	.88	13.04	.001
Within Groups	89	6.02	.07		
Total	90	6.90			

II. ANOVA for Proportion of Objectives that Stated a Condition

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	1.29	1.29	16.58	.000
Within Groups	89	6.93	.08		
Total	90	8.22			

III. ANOVA for Proportion of Objectives

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	F. Prob.
Between Groups	1	1.37	1.37	9.51	.003
Within Groups	89	12.86	.14		
Total	90	14.23			

Table 8

ANALYSES OF VARIANCE FOR PROPORTION OF CASES
WITH SELF-SUFFICIENCY STATED OBJECTIVES

I. ANOVA for Proportion of Objectives Stating Self-Sufficiency

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	.58	.58	9.24	.003
Within Groups	89	5.57	.06		
Total	90	6.15			

II. ANOVA for Proportion of Objectives Stating Non-Self-Sufficiency

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	.02	.02	.882	.35
Within Groups	89	1.58	.02		
Total	90	1.60			

III. ANOVA for Proportion of Objectives with Indeterminable Self-Sufficiency

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	.79	.79	9.97	.002
Within Groups	89	7.01	.08		
Total	90	7.08			

Table 9

PRECISION OF MEASUREMENT OF IEP OBJECTIVES

	ESY n = 57		Non-ESY n = 35		
	Total Number of Objectives Across Subjects	$\bar{X}$/Subject	Total Number of Objectives Across Subjects	$\bar{X}$/Subject	Sig.
Precision of Measurement for IEP Objectives					
1. Indeterminable	265	$\bar{X}$ = 4.65 S.D. = 3.49	92	$\bar{X}$ = 2.63 S.D. = 1.81	P < .01
2. Indirect/anecdotal	0	--	0	--	
3. Indirect/informal checklist	0	--	0	--	
4. Indirect/formal checklist	0	--	0	--	
5. Anecdotal unspecified	185	$\bar{X}$ = 3.25 S.D. = 3.26	132	$\bar{X}$ = 3.77 S.D. = 4.63	
6. Anecdotal/direct	259	$\bar{X}$ = 4.54 S.D. = 5.01	291	$\bar{X}$ = 8.31 S.D. = 6.44	P <.01
7. Direct/non-standard	0		0		
8. Direct/standard	0		0		
9. Standard reliable	0		0		
10. Direct/standard reliable	0		0		

Table 10

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR PRECISION OF MEASUREMENT
OF I.E.P. OBJECTIVES

28

I. Indeterminable Precision

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	88.53	88.53	10.02	.002
Within Groups	90	795.15	8.84		
Total	91	883.68			

II. Anecdotal Direct Assessment

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	308.27	308.27	9.85	.002
Within Groups	90	2817.68	31.33		
Total	91	3125.96			

Table 11

EVIDENCE OF REGRESSION/RECOUPMENT

Regression/Recoupment Data	ESY (n = 26) Number of Cases for Each Type of Measurement	Non-ESY (n = 17) Number of Cases for Each Type of Measurement
1. Indeterminable	3	1
2. Indirect/anecdotal	15	7
3. Indirect/informal checklist	14	14
4. Indirect/formal checklist	0	0
5. Anecdotal unspecified	0	0
6. Anecdotal/direct	1	0
7. Direct/non-standard	0	0
8. Direct/standard	0	0
9. Standard reliable	0	0
10. Direct/standard reliable	0	0
Missing Data	n = 79	n = 72

Table 12

OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE VARIABLES

	ESY n = 105						Non-ESY n = 89						
	n					$\bar{X}$	n					$\bar{X}$	
Years of Prior ESY	0 16	1 12	2 9	7 1		58% prior ESY	0 22	1 0	2 1	7 0		4% prior ESY	
Parent-School Contracts	0 97	1 7	2 0	4 0	6 1	.124 S.D.=.63	0 85	1 0	2 3	4 1	6 0	.112 S.D.=.553	
School-Parent Contracts	22	14	17	20	15	2.53 S.D.=2.02	23	15	18	13	0	2.06 S.D.=1.76	*p<.08

Discussion

The variables evaluated to identify differences between ESY and non-ESY students were based on the eligibility criteria suggested by Battle v. Commonwealth (1980). These criteria include: 1) the degree and severity of the handicap, 2) evidence of regression-recoupment, and 3) self-sufficiency goals.

Nature and Severity of Handicap

In the current investigation, subjects were selected from the group of students classified as severely and profoundly mentally retarded. Severely emotionally disturbed students were excluded because of the variation between intermediate units in the interpretation of this classification. Within the group of students classified as severely and profoundly mentally retarded, subjects were grouped by their eligibility or ineligibility for extended school year services in 1982. Other variables related to the degree and nature of the handicap were compared across eligibility groups to determine if the groups differed in the characteristics of their handicap. In general, the students who qualified for extended school year and those who did not qualify, did not differ on the variables related to the degree and severity of their handicap.

Standardized test information was not available for most subjects in either group. The difficulty of conducting standardized testing with individuals whose handicaps are multiple and severe has been noted by Bricker and Campbell (1980), Duncan, Sbardelletic, Maheady, and Sainato (1981), and Fewell and Cone (1983). Often a psychologist does not obtain a basal score on the commonly used intelligence tests. Sailor (1978) has recommended that intelligence tests not be used with students

whose handicaps are severe. Rather, Sailor (1978) advocates the use of adaptive behavior scales and criterion referenced education assessment. While many subjects in the current study had been assessed with published or teacher-made checklists, the lack of standardization of many of these assessment tools made cross-subject comparisons inappropriate. Given the problems of testing students with severe handicaps, the investigators particularly noted if either the ESY or non-ESY students had been tested or labeled "untestable." The small data obtained for this variable suggested that the groups did not differ by testability. The large amount of missing data further implies that the field has moved towards alternatives to intelligence testing for individuals with severe and multiple handicaps. This trend is compatible with Sailor's (1978) recommendation to find alternatives to intelligence testing to assess service eligibility for severely handicapped students.

Another variable that reflects students' handicaps was the school year placement. This investigation considered the restrictiveness of the placement and the number of related special services. Again, the groups did not differ in this regard. Most subjects received services in self-contained special education classes in public schools. It is possible that more students' classes were in segregated schools than noted since this was not always specified. The data collectors assumed that the "severely profoundly retarded class" was in a regular public school unless the I.E.P. noted otherwise. Given this limitation in the sensitivity of the data on placement, the groups did not differ in restrictiveness of their school year placement. Further, no significant

differences were found in the number of special services each group received.

Another set of variables that could possibly have distinguished the groups defined the nature and severity of their handicaps by diagnostic labels used in reports by educators and psychologists or physicians and psychiatrists. Overall, the groups did not differ on the eleven label categoris in either set of reports. One difference was found in the number of health impairments reported by physicians. Students who qualified for extended school year services had significantly more health impairment labels in physician's reports. This result could be interpreted in several ways. One obvious interpretation would be that students who qualify for extended school year have more health impairments. It is not at all clear in this case whether or not health impairments actually influence skill regression or whether or not physician diagnosed health impairments are perceived by educators as creating a risk for regression. On the other hand, students who qualify for extended school year may have advocates (their parents or teachers) who secure more treatment generally for these students including more comprehensive physical examinations. Rather than having a causal relationship, the physicians' labels and eligibility for extended school year may both relate to this advocacy for treatment.

Given the cluster of variables related to subjects' degree and severity of their handicaps, eligibility did not seem to be influenced by these variables except by physicians' labels of health impairments. It should be noted that the subjects were limited to students classified as severely and profoundly mentally retarded. If all handicapped students had been studied, it is quite probable that most students

served in extended school year services would be severely handicapped, in contrast to mildly or moderately handicapped. In fact, Stotland and Mancuso (1982) have noted a trend in some localities to exclude automatically children who are not severely handicapped.

The difficulty in including children who are labeled severely emotionally disturbed highlights the need for improving classifiction definitions for severely handicapped children. Geiger and Justen (1983) surveyed state departments of education and noted a trend towards using non-categorical definitions for severely handicapped children. Such definitions include children who are "functionally" severely retarded by sensory, physical, and behavioral impairments and recognize their common educational needs. A national organization, The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, has been created that similarly addresses the issues of a non-categorical, diverse group of people whose handicaps are more severe. Pennsylvania has not moved towards the use of a broad definition for severely handicapped children, but does include classification for severely multihandicapped. However, children with autism and other severe behavior disorders may not fit easily in this classification. Given the varied responses the investigators received to the term "severely emotionally disturbed," it would be interesting to conduct case studies of authistic children to determine how they are classified across localities and the influence of their classification on extended school year services.

Self-Sufficiency Objectives

Given that students who are severely and profoundly mentally retarded with similar diagnoses may or may not qualify for extended school year services, it is important to consider other criteria for

eligibility implied by school record information. One other criteria set forth in Battle v. Commonwealth (1980) was self-sufficiency. The purpose of the extended program is to prevent skill regression that impedes self-sufficient living. Thus, the objectives addressed in an extended school year program should relate to self-sufficiency. In the current research extended school year objectives were missing from most records. When present, extended school year goals often replicated school year I.E.P. goals. This replication would be appropriate since the extended services are intended to maintain skills acquired in the school year. To evaluate the self-sufficiency criteria, this investigation focused on the school year I.E.P. with the assumption that extended services would be based on all or part of this plan. By looking at the number of objectives related to self-sufficiency, some indication of the priority of this focus of instruction could be measured.

Self-sufficiency was broadly defined by the context, materials, and behavior stated in the objectives. The context could appropriately be the classroom or school if the behavior would be adaptive in that context (e.g., toileting but not street crossing) or if a community setting was stated (e.g., "at the grocery store") or if a community setting were implied (e.g., "ride the city bus" implies public transit system setting). Materials would be appropriate to self-sufficiency if they were the real items used in daily living or depictions of real materials (e.g., "slides of grocery store"); or real materials could be implied. The behavior was considered to be a self-sufficient one if it was an overt behavior related to a realt context or material as defined. If the context or material could not be inferred or only include

physical positioning equipment, the objective was considered to be "indeterminable." If it clearly listed a context or material not related to daily living, it was rated "non-self-sufficiency." Examples of artificial materials included peg boards and bead stringing which typically are not used by non-handicapped people after preschool age in their daily living. No artificial context was found on the I.E.P.'s. Examples of indeterminable objectives were "will tolerate a prone board" and "will participate in a group activity." While both behaviors could be both behaviors could be related to self-sufficiency, the lack of specifity makes this uncertain. Examples of self-sufficiency objectives were "feed herself independently at lunch with a fork" and "swin independently" (implies a pool context). Thus, self-sufficiency was defined as daily living activities engaged in by non-handicapped people after preschool age. Activities that would be considered "readiness" would only meet this criteria if they incorporated use of real materials.

Despite this broad definition, most objectives of students who qualified for extended school year services had indeterminable self-sufficiency. Surprisingly, students who qualified for extended school year services had significantly fewere objectives related to self-sufficiency than those who did not qualify. Several explanations may account for this startling finding.

First, it may have been more difficult to plan self sufficiency objectives for students who qualified for extended school year servies. Studetns who present limited skill repertoires due to sensory, physical or behavioral impairments may challenge the teacher's creativity to develop community living curriculum. The same group who present this

challenge may also show signs of summer regression and thus, require extended school year services. Snell (1983) has described methods for developing community living curriculum for severely handicapped students. One idea Snell (1983) describes is adapting activities for students to participate to some degree, if not fully. For example, a physically handicapped student may not be able to dress himself, but might learn to express a preference for each day's clothing (e.g., by eye blinks or nodding for "yes"). Developing community skills for students whose handicaps are most severe is a newly developing curriculum idea. Teachers who have not received recent specializing training in educating students with severe handicaps may not understand the rationale or methodology for making such adaptations. Thus, teachers may be better able to develop self-sufficiency objectives for students who have more skills including the skill to retain what they have learned across breaks.

This explanation would not be supported, though, by the comparison of diagnostic labels across groups. These comparisons did not present the ESY group as having more or more severe handicaps. However, this measure of diagnostic labels may not have been sensitive to skill differences. For example, two children labeled "severely retarded" and "spastic quadriplegic" may have widely discrepant skills. One child may have communication and some limb use while the other does not. The teacher might be able to think of more self-sufficiency objectives for the child with a recognizable communication system. Yet in the current study, both children would have two diagnostic labels -- one in each of the same category.

The lack of test information that could be used for cross group comparisons is another potential loss of sensitivity to skill differences between groups. As mentioned previously, adaptive behavior scales did not lend themselves to cross subject comparisons due to the nature of many of the scales utilized. Anecdotal evaluations were studied for inclusion of diagnostic labels. While behavioral descriptors may have been more sensitive to differences between groups, the variation and vagueness of this terminology frequently used did not lend itself to categorization for analysis. Thus the question of differences between groups level of handicap can not be resolved with the existing data.

Another explanation for the lack of self-sufficiency in the objectives could be that the definition used to assess this variable might be invalid. In the definition used, specification of real materials most influenced objectives towards self-sufficiency. The question can be raised about the appropriateness of rising real materials to enhance self-sufficiency. Perhaps objectives related to self-sufficiency need to be less specific. In fact, another significant finding was that ESY objectives were less specific. The ESY objectives contained fewer statements of conditions, behavior, and criteria.

The validity of the definition used is based on writings of various authors on functional or life skills curriculum development for severely handicapped students (e.g., Brown, Brnaston-McLean, Baumgart, Vincent, Falvey, & Schroeder, 1979; Koegel, Rincover & Egel, 1982; Sailor & Guess, 1983; Snell, 1983). Most of these authors specify the need to use real materials in instruction. For example, Brown, Hamre-Nietupski and Nietupski (1976) state: "The instructional materials, tasks,

consequences, objectives, and criteria to which severely handicapped students are exposed in education settings should resemble those that students will encounter and need in community domestic, social, leisure, and vocational settings. However cumbersome, time consuming, inconvenient, or expensive it may be to do so, the pegs, felt squares, pictures of money, tokens, pictures of money, tokens, pictures, and many, if not all of the commercially available kits and irrelevant paper and pencil tasks should be faded out. ... real tools and objects ... real appliances and utensils... must replace the." p.14. In the current study an objective could be classified as self-sufficient if it included a community context or real materials. Real materials or context could also clearly be implied by the behavior (e.g., sour milk).

If the importance of using real daily living materials is accepted as a valid measure of self-sufficiency, it still may be possible that many teachers have not been exposed to the importance of their use. Thus, they may perceive self-sufficiency objectives as more global, non-specific objectives. It may also be possible that supervisors have guided teachers towards use of more bague objectives for extended school year children because of their perception that this practice will result in teaching skills with greater applicability. However, as Brown, et al. (1976) note, many severely handicapped children do not generalize a skill across untrained settings and materials. The teacher ensures a student will perform an important daily living skill by teaching that skill directly with the materials he or she will use.

Thus two explanations may account for the differences between groups on the number of objectives stating self-sufficiency. On the one hand, the groups may differ in skills. The ESY group's skill deficits

may challenge the teacher's creativity in developing life skills objectives. On the other hand, the groups may not differ as supported by data on educational labels. Instead, teachers and/or their supervisors may perceive that vague objectives allow for instruction of skills with broad utility. By contrast, vague objectives may leave the studetn with few real daily living skills. In either case, the need seems to exist for teacher training in developing objectives for extended school year students.

Data on Regression/Recoupment

The lack of data in the files on regression and recoupment was surprising. When available, this evaluation was based on indirect assessment that was either anecdotal or an informal checklist. One explanation for the lack of information on extended school year eligibility such as reports on regression/recoupment could be the use of separate files on extended school year. While the investigators asked for all files and all information for each student, in one school the extended school year information had been filed together separate from the student's folder and could not be located. Also, some localities did not keep old educational records. One intermedite unit discarded all I.E.P.'s after they expired and were replaced by current ones. Thus, a large number of I.E.P.'s for 1981-1982 from one locality were not available for this research.

Given the lack of data, few conclusions can be made about measurement of regression to determine extended school year eligiblity. The few cases found reflected the use of indirect, informal assessment. This practice contrasts with Larsen, et al.'s (1981) recommendation for ongoing direct assessment to determine eligibility. This type of

assessment may be the single most important criteria for determining eligibility since it can document service need and provide accountability for skill maintenance services. Snell (1983) has described several procedures that can be used for measuring I.E.P. objectives for severely handicapped students.

Other Administrative Variables

In the absence of use of direct ongoing measurement or other clearcut criteria for eligibility, it was hypothesized that other administrative variables might guide eligibility. One such variable would be prior placement in extended school year services. However, almost no data was found on prior placement. Drawing conclusions from data on less than a third of the cases would not be appropriate.

Contacts between parents and the school did reveal one significant difference. The subjects who received extended school year services had more documented contacts by schools to the parents than for students not eligible. Since so few parent contacts were found, it is uncertain if these were not filed in students' records or actually not initiated. The pattern of school contacts may support the potentially greater documentation in extended school year students files. Some of the school contacts were regarding extended school year services for both groups. Logistically, more communication could be necessary for students receiving extended services (e.g., to approve the extended year I.E.P.).

Limitations of the Current Research

The current investigation was limited solely to data contained in school files. By design, findings were limited to current practices for file management. While differences between filing systems were evident

between localities, the current research focused on a statewide analysis. These results may not hold true for an individual locality nor for a particular student.

Services for the subjects included in this study have advanced greatly since passage of P.L. 94-142. However, many teachers for severely handicapped students have not attended special education teacher training programs with updated information on curriculum and methods for severely handicapped learners. Part of the Fialkowski v. Shapp (1975) settlement agreement outlined statewide dissemination for the Philadelphia urban training model. This dissemination is currently being initiated and could impact variables such as self-sufficiency and skill measurement.

The data missing in this study prevented using discriminant analyses across all variables. However, the possibility should be considered that the variables examined have an interactive impact. Further, these variables may not create eligibility but may relate to an unidentified causal variable (e.g., undocumented assessment, parent or teacher advocacy, administrative policies).

Future Directions

From the record review of the current study, it is apparent that further documentation is needed in students' files regarding how eligibility is determined and the extent of services provided. One may tentatively conclude that the lack of documentation reflects a lack of technology to determine eligibility for extended school year services. Only three studies have evaluated extended school year services (Bahling, 1980; Edgar, et al, 1977; McMahon, 1983). None of these studies addressed the quetion of eligibility, but rather service

effectiveness. Research is needed to identify accurate and applicable procedures to measure maintenance during school breaks that my predict summer skill regression.

References

Armstrong v. Kline, 476 F.Supp. 583 (E.D. Pa. 1979). Aff'd CA78-0172 (3rd Cir., July 15, 1980).

Austin, G. R., Rogers, B. G., & Walbesser, H. H. (1972). The effectiveness of summer compensatory education: A review of the research. Review of Educational Research, 47, 171-181.

Bahling, E. (1980). Extended school year program, Intermediate Unit #5, June-August, 1980. Paper presented at the Annual International Convention of CEC. ERIC Document 208 609.

Battle v. Commonwealth, 79-2158, 79-2188-90, 79-2568-70 (3rd Cir., July 18, 1980).

Bricker, W., & Campbell, P. H. (1980). Interdisciplinary programming. In W. Sailor, L. Brown, & B. Wilcox (Eds.), Teaching the severely handicapped. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Brown, L., Nietupski, J., Hamre-Nietupski, S. (1976). Criterion of ultimate functioning. In Thomas, M. A. (Ed.)., Hey, don't forget about me! Reston, Va.: CEC.

Crim, R. Extended school year programs, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 105 635).

Deno, E. (1970). Special education as developmental capital. Exceptional Children, 37, 229-237.

Duncan, D., Sbardellati, E., Maheady, L., & Sainato, D. (1981). Nondiscriminatory assessment of severely physically handicapped individuals. The Journal of the Association for People with Severe Handicaps, 6, 17-22.

Edgar, E., Spence, W., & Kenowitz, L. (1977). Extended school year for

the handicapped: Is it working? Journal of Special Education, 11, 441-447.

Geiger, W. L., & Justen, J. E. (1983). Definitions of severely handicapped and requirements for teacher certification: A survey of state departments of education. The Journal of the Association for the Severely Handicapped, 8, 25-29.

Guess, D., & Noonan, M. J. (1982). Curricula and instructional procedures for severely handicapped students. Focus on Exceptional Children, 14, 1-12.

Georgia Association of Retarded Citizens v. McDaniel. C.V.A. No. C-78-1950A. N. D. Georgia, 1979.

Healey, W. C., & Reichman, J. (1982). The extended school year controversy: Judicial v. educational considerations. Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children.

Holvoet, J., O'Neil, C., Chazdon, L., Carr, D., & Warner, J. (1983). Hey, do we really have to take data? TASH, 8, 56-70.

Knezevich, S. J. Administration of public education. New York: Harper & Row, 1969).

Larsen, L., Goodman, L., & Glean, R. (1981). Issues in the implementation of extended school year programs for handicapped students. Exceptional Children, 47, 256-263.

Leonard, J. (1981). 180 day barrier: Issues and concerns. Exceptional Children, 47, 246-253.

Levitan, H., & Kiraly, J., Jr. The effect of the summer vacation on the mathematics achievement of pupils in the Bozeman public schools at the fourth, fifth, and sixth grade levels. (Doctoral dissertation, Montana State University, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts

International, 1976, 37, 853-A.

NSBA opposes year-round handicapped programs. Education of the handicapped, 1980, 6, 3-4.

Mahoney v. Administrative School District No. 1, 601 P.2d. (or Ct. Appt. 1979).

McMahon, J. (1983). Extended school year programs. Exceptional Children, 49, 457-461.

Rieth, H. J., Polsgrove, L., & Semmel, M. I. (1979). Relationship between instructional time and academic achievement: Implications for research and practice. Education Unlimited, 1, 53-56.

Scanlon v. Battle. 66 L. Ed. 2nd, 837, 1981.

Schleien, S. J., Ash, T., Kiernan, J., & Wehman, P. (1981). Developing independent cooking skills in a profoundly retarded woman. Journal of the Association for the Severely Handicapped, 6, 23-29.

Sontag, E., Smith, J., & Certo, N. (Ed.) (1977). Educational programming for the severely and profoundly handicapped. Reston, Va.: CEC.

Snell, M. E. (Ed.) (1978). Systematic instruction of the moderately and severely handicapped. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, p. 20-73.

Snell, M. E. (1983). Developing the IEP: Selecting and assessing skills. In M. E. Snell (Ed.), Systematic instruction of the moderately and severely handicapped. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, p. 76-112.

Stainback, W. C., Stainback, S. B., & Hatcher, C. W. (1983). Developing programs. The Journal of the Association for the Severely Handicapped, 8, 5-9.

Stotland, J. F., & Mancuso, E. (1982). Continued problems with extended school year programming in Pennsylvania. Philadelphia, Pa.: Education Law Center, Inc., December 9, 1982.

Thomas, M. A. Hey, don't forget about me! Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children, 1976.

Turner, K. (198). Determining regression/recoupment in the extended school litigation for handicapped pupils. CASE Newsletter, p. 4.

Appendix A

Appendix B

October 5, 1983

Dear

At a recent meeting of the Intermediate Unit Special Education Directors, held on June 29th, 1983, we received an endorsement to conduct a research project pertaining to the extended school year program. We have also received the approval of the I.U. Executive Committee. We are writing this letter to serve as an initial contact in reference to this project, through Lehigh University, pertaining to eligibility for extended school year programs. The main purpose of this research is to examine the relationship between information contained in student files and participation in ESY programs.

What we need from you is the following: 1.)written permission to conduct research; 2.) names and addresses of all I.U. students classified as severely emotionally disturbed, severely profoundly mentally retarded; 3.) list of all I.U. students who received ESY services during the summer of 1982; 4.) access, contingent upon parental permission, to I.U. student's files for our staff to collect information over a three day period. We would like to reassure you that no individual students will be identified, nor will we analyze data so that individual I.U.'s are identifiable. Furthermore, we will provide an affidavit and pledge of confidentiality for both the student and I.U., as well as secure parental/ guardian permission.

Upon receipt of your written permission, we will contact you to arrange further details. Timothy Knoster, a doctoral candidate for special education, will be collecting the data along with Carole Wilansky, a graduate student in the school psychology program. If you have any questions pertaining to general details, etc. please feel free to call Timothy Knoster at (215) 861-3254. Dr. Diane Browder may also be contacted to assist in answering any questions regarding the purpose of the study, etc. Her number is: (215) 861-3267.

Thank you for your time and concern on this matter. We feel that with your assistance we will be able to enhance ESY program service delivery throughout the Commonwealth. We look forward to working with you on this endeavor and will await your written reply.

Sincerely,

Diane Browder

Diane M. Browder, Ph.D
Principal Investigator and
Assistant Professor of Special Education

James E Lentz

Ed Lentz, Ph.D
Principal Investigator and
Assistant Professor of School Psychology

Timothy P. Knoster

Timothy P. Knoster, M.Ed
Project Assistant

Carole Wilansky

Carole Wilansky
Project Assistant

* AFFIDAVIT AND PLEDGE *

* TO MAINTAIN CONFIDENTIALITY *

I understand the sensitivity of the data being collected for the Predictors of Eligibility for ESY Students and further understand that no person connected with the project will disclose to any person, in any form, any personally identifiable data collected in connection with this project. I, _____, therefore pledge that I will not disclose to any person, in any form, any personally identifiable data that I, or anyone else, may collect in connection with this project.

_____	_____
Witness	Name
_____	_____
Witness	Signature
_____	_____
Date	Date

Abstract

The proposed Predictors of Eligibility for ESY students would identify characteristics of students served and of students not served by extended school year programs for the handicapped. To make this identification, the project investigators would collect information from 150 students' files on nine variables (e.g. age, type of handicap, regression data) for two groups: students served in 1982 ESY programs and severely emotionally disturbed and severely and profoundly mentally retarded students not served in 1982 ESY programs. A multiple regression equation would be derived to determine the significant variables for service and for nonservice. Subjects would be selected randomly from intermediate units throughout Pennsylvania. This project would arouse national interest, regarding provision of ESY services, especially because of its location in the state of Pennsylvania, which was the defendant in Armstrong v. Kline.

Appendix C

Appendix D

Lehigh University

School of Education
Special Education Programs

524 Brodhead Avenue
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18015
telephone (215) 861-3256

February 3, 1984

We are writing this letter as a follow up to our recent phone conversation pertaining to arrangements for your participation in our research on Eligibility for the Extended School Year program. Enclosed are the parental permission letters to be sent to the randomly selected participants in your I.U. Also included in this packet are the affidavit, and the set of random numbers for selection of participants. Detailed instructions may be found on the attached sheet. As was mentioned in our phone conversation, we have decided to limit the scope of our study to the severely, profoundly mentally retarded population, because of definitional problems with the SED category. Therefore you will find the SED population deleted from the random sampling.

We will contact you within a week to finalize travel arrangements. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance. We look forward to meeting you and appreciate your participation in this project.

Sincerely,

Diane Browder

Diane M. Browder, Ph.D.
Principal Investigator and
Assistant Professor of Special Education

Ed Lentz

Ed Lentz, Ph.D
Principal Investigator and
Assistant Professor of School Psychology

Timothy P. Knoster

Timothy P. Knoster, M.Ed

Carole Wilansky

Carole Wilansky, M.Ed

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUGGESTED PROCEDURES
FOR SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE ESY STUDY

1. Please compile a list of students that you served in 1981-82 and who were classified prior to that school year as a) severely, profoundly mentally retarded or b) severely emotionally disturbed, autistic or multiply handicapped (with one condition being severe emotional disturbance).

2. Classify them into one of four categories: a) severely, profoundly mentally retarded receiving ESY services during the summer of 1982; b) severely, profoundly mentally retarded not receiving ESY services during the summer of 1982; c) severely emotionally disturbed, autistic or multiply handicapped (with one condition being severe emotional disturbance) who received ESY services during the summer of 1982; d) severely emotionally disturbed, autistic, or multiply handicapped (with one condition being severe emotional disturbance) who did not receive ESY services during the summer of 1982.

3. For each of the four categories assign a sequential number (1 through the number in each category) to each student.

4. We will provide you for each of the four categories (from a random numbers table), a set of numbers, each corresponding to a students' name.

5. We will provide for each selected student an explanation letter, parental permission form, stamped envelope (with your address for parental returns), and a blank stamped envelope for you to mail materials to parents. Parents will return permission slips to you.

6. You would then address the envelopes and send them only to those parents corresponding to the chosen numbers. Some of your lists for some of the categories or for who received ESY services may be small, this is to be expected.

* We have attempted to minimize your work although you still would need to assist us to some extent.

I.U. SUMMARY FORM FOR LEHIGH UNIVERSITY ESY STUDY

_____ (1) Number of severely, profoundly mentally retarded students receiving ESY services during the summer of 1982

_____ (2) Number of severely, profoundly mentally retarded students not receiving ESY services during the summer of 1982

_____ (3) Number of severely emotionally disturbed, autistic, or multiply handicapped (with one condition being severe emotional disturbance) children receiving ESY services during the summer of 1982

_____ (4) Number of severely emotionally disturbed, autistic, or multiply handicapped (with one condition being severe emotional disturbance) children not receiving ESY services during the summer of 1982

_____ Name of contact person at I.U.

(Given the numbers in the above categories we will be able to provide the correct number of students who will be randomly selected from each I.U.)

Appendix E

Stratified Sampling of Intermediate Units

	ESY	Non-ESY
A	20	0
B	9	0
C	5	1
D	7	11
E	8	13
F	3	4
G	3	5
H	11	7
I	3	3
J	5	9
K	26	33
L	5	3
Total	105	89

Total Subjects 195

Appendix F

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY

524 Brodhead Avenue, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18015 (215) 861-3250

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Department of Human Development

Dear Parent:

We are writing this letter to serve as an introduction of ourselves and to request your assistance with our research project. We are currently funded by the federal government through Lehigh University to conduct research throughout the Commonwealth pertaining to enrollment of students into extended school year programs. Your child has been randomly selected (pursuant to your permission) by our research team to serve as a member of our sample population. What this selection entails is for your child's school records to be made available for our team to review and to collect information. This research will in no way alter your child's current educational program and no direct contact will occur between your child and our staff. Additionally, to protect your child's confidentiality, we will not retain information from the records that would enable us to identify your child. We are interested in information abut state wide procedures, not specifically about any one child. Complete confidentiality concerning your child will be maintained.

Please be aware that the director of the I.U., where your child receives special education services, has approved our research contingent upon parental consent. We would like to begin gathering information as soon as possible. Your prompt reply pertaining to this matter will be greatly appreciated. Please fill out the attached consent form and return it to us in the enclosed stamped envelope. Thank you for your assistance on this matter. Feel free to contact us at (215) 861-3254, or at the above address if you have any questions. You may withdraw your permission at any time.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Diane Browder

Diane M. Browder, Ph.D
Principal Investigator and
Assistant Professor of Special Education

Ed Lentz, Ph.D
Principal Investigator and
Assistant Professor of School Psychology

Timothy P. Knoster

Timothy P. Knoster, M.Ed

Carole Wilansky

Carole Wilansky

Please initial one space below:

_____ Yes, I give my permission for my child's school records to be made available for this research.

_____ No, I do not want my child's school records to be made available for this research.

If parental consent is granted, please initial the appropriate box in reference to receiving a copy of the research results upon completion of the study:

_____ Yes, I would like to receive a copy of research results.

_____ No, I do not wish to receive a copy of research results.

Appendix G

Data Collection Sheet

Proposal Predictor Variables

#1 IQ score (standardized IQ test) and
#11 Score on developmental checklist or adaptive behavior scale

List all tests which could apply to either of the variables listed above:

#1. name of test _____

date of test _____

CA (at time of test) _____

IQ/DQ (full scale) _____

MA/DA _____

Comparison Score (as for ex. yielded in the AAMD) _____

title of the person who administered the test _____

title of report writer _____

#2. name of test _____

date of test _____

CA (at time of test) _____

IQ/DQ (full scale) _____

MA/DA _____

Comparison Score _____

title of the person who administered the test _____

title of the report writer _____

#3. name of test _____

date of test _____

CA (at time of test) _____

IQ/DQ (full scale) _____

MA/DA _____

Comparison Score _____

title of the person who administered the test _____

title of the report writer _____

#4. name of test _____

date of test _____

CA (at time of test) _____

IQ/DQ (full scale) _____

MA/DA _____

Comparison Score _____

title of the person who administered the test _____

title of the report writer _____

#2. School year placement (using Deno's cascade for rank ordering)

name of full time special class placement (if applicable) '81-'82

_____

If part time special services, specify which services are provided and proportional amount of time in each placement:

Other instructional placement options, not covered above:

#3. Frequency of recorded parent contact (e.g. number of letters, phone calls recorded, conferences). '81-'82

type of contact	purpose of contact	who initiated

List all ESY, IEP objectives, verbatim, and the measurements utilized: (81-82)

ESY objectives	measurement

#6. Data pertaining to skill regression (ordinal scale of measurement precision)

List justification for or against ESY services. List time period discussed.

#7. Number of years prior placement in ESY (prior to '82)

_____

#8. Chronological Age

birth date _____

#9. Educational labels/ psychological labels/ classification of handicap

List all classifications (psychological and educational) applied to the student, prior to the '83 school year. Also list the date on which the classification was made, and the title of the person who presented the label:

classification	source (1,2,etc.)	title of person	date
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			

#10. Medical/diagnosis/ label or psychiatric label (number and type)

List all medical diagnosis/ labels and psychiatric diagnosis/ labels applied to the student, along with the date of diagnosis, and the title of the person having made the diagnosis; also specify if the medical or psychiatric problem has changed since the date of the diagnosis.

	label/ diagnosis	source	title	date
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				

#5. Precision of measurement of IEP objectives for self-sufficiency
#4. Number of school year IEP objectives directly related to self-sufficiency

List all IEP objectives, verbatim, and the measurements used: ('81-'82)

IEP objectives	measurement